

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated **November 18, 2004**, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-27 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-27 stand rejected by the Examiner.
- Applicant has amended Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15 and 20-24.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 11-13, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US. Pat. No. 6,721,736 to Krug et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the §102(e) rejection.

Krug et al. discloses a method performed by a meta search engine. The meta search engine uses the search response from a multiplicity of different primary search engines and extracts, using an interface, search results from those primary engines to provide a multiplicity of hits to a user. The method comprises automatically adapting the interface to new search response forms from the primary search engines (Krug et al., Abstract, Figure 2).

Applicant have amended independent Claims 1, 11, 20 and 21 to recite that a location on a display is user-selected and that a category or digital content item is displayed only after a user-selected location is received.

Applicants submit that Krug et al. does not teach or suggest the display of a category or a digital content item only after a user-selected location is received.

Since Krug et al. fails to teach or suggest that a location on a display is user-selected and that a category or a digital content item is displayed only after a user-selected location is received, it cannot anticipate amended independent Claims 1, 11, 20 and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection and submits that amended independent Claims 1, 11, 20 and 21 patentably define over the cited art.

Further, since dependent Claims 2-3 and 12-13 are dependent on independent Claims 1 and 11 respectively, dependent Claims 2-3 and 12-13 likewise patentably define over the cited art. Applicant also respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection on these dependent claims.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Dependent Claims 4-5, 14-15 and 22-23 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,721,736 to Krug et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,691,108 to Li. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Krug et al. discloses a method performed by a meta search engine. The meta search engine uses the search response from a multiplicity of different primary search engines and extracts, using an interface, search results from those primary engines to provide a multiplicity of hits to a user. The method comprises automatically adapting the interface to new search response forms from the primary search engines (Krug et al., Abstract, Figure 2).

Li discloses a method to crawl vast search spaces including markup language documents. Topic distillation and site distillation methodologies are incorporated into the focused search strategy. Categorizations of search results may be initiated by the search engine itself or categories may be specified in conjunction with the original request for information (Li, Abstract).

Applicants have amended dependent Claims 4-5, 14-15 and 22-23 to more clearly recite aspects of Applicant's invention. Specifically, display locations are user-selected and digital content items are displayed only after the user-selected location is received.

Applicants submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made with respect to amended Claims 4-5, 14-15 and 22-23 because the cited references lack the limitation of displaying digital content items after a user selected location is received. Applicants submit that neither Krug et al. nor Li teach or suggest displaying a digital content item after a user-selected display location is received. Accordingly, neither Krug et al. nor Li, either alone or in combination, can render amended Claims 4-5, 14-15, and 22-23 obvious.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and reconsideration of amended Claims 4-5, 14-15 and 22-23 as these pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

DOCKET NO.: BELL-0111/01145
Application No.: 09/895,989
Office Action Dated: November 18, 2004


PATENT

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in a condition for allowance upon entry of the amendments herein. Applicants earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2005



Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50, 800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439